UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Testimony of a Conscientious Objector—
A Private Letter Now Made Public - - - - - - - - - - C. C.

The Dilemma of a Pacifist - - - - - - - - - - - - *William Bottomley*

The Elusive Panacea - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Frederick Shuttleworth*

Parade - - - - - - - - - - *Sylvia Rankin*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 12

Chicago, February 19, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 183
Jottings—J. H. H. 185
Is There Any Feasible Plan for Banishing War from the World?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 186

ARTICLES—
The Testimony of a Conscientious Objector—A Private Letter Now Made Public—C. C. 187
The Dilemma of a Pacifist—WILLIAM BOTTOMLEY 188
The Elusive Panacea—FREDERICK SHUTTLEWORTH 191
Parade—SYLVIA RANKIN 192
On the Pacifist Front—IX 193

POETRY—
He Spoke of Bread—TRACY MYGATT 194

THE STUDY TABLE—
"The West"—FLORA WHITE 195
War Profits—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 195
Comparative Religion—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 195

CORRESPONDENCE—
Peace Heroes—ABRAHAM CRONBACH 196
Dual Personality—L. N. S. 196

THE FIELD—
Not a War for Freedom 182
Fr. Rice and Anti-Semitism—The *Catholic Worker* 196
The Czech Ten Commandments—*Zion's Herald* 196

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Not a War for Freedom

[Editor's Note: We find this article in an English labor paper. It is an impressive comment on England and English liberty that articles of this kind can be published under war conditions.]

The battle of words shows no signs of abating and political confusion reigns supreme. Following pressure of public opinion the Government and the Labor Party stated their war aims. Apart from the fact that Herbert Morrison was more virulent in his attacks on Germany there was little to choose between his speech and the Prime Minster's. "Naziism," that is our enemy. Whereas in the past the Government stated that it was not in the least concerned with the "internal affairs" of Germany, so long as British interests were left alone, now, one of the strongest points to support its war aims is the barbaric regime existing in Germany! To strengthen the hatred of the German people, the White Paper on German Atrocities was recently published. The statements are undoubtedly true, but the fact remains that such conditions existed in Germany six years ago, and then, far from exposing these crimes, the British Government was eagerly helping the Nazi regime to get on its feet with loans and raw materials. That the sudden interest in the welfare of German political prisoners is based on the humane ideals of this Government can easily be disproved. Fascism in Italy, which has given not a few lessons to Hitler in his rise to power, has adopted methods of repression too brutal to describe. The islands of Lipari, Lampedusa, and Ponza, have for years been vast concentration camps to which political prisoners by the thousands have been sent to languish until death finally freed them. Perhaps, also, Mr. Morrison remembers that his colleagues in the Socialist Party in the Italian Parliament, such as Matteotti and Amendola, were murdered by order of Mussolini. Yet today, Mussolini represents—to quote the Government—the angel of Peace, and at the outbreak of war all parties in the House were unanimous in expressing their appreciation of Mussolini's efforts for Peace. Apart from his brutal activity in Abyssinia and Spain, the recent invasion of Albania should not be forgotten. At the beginning of November the Government decided to apply to the Italian Government for recognition of the Consul-General in Tirana, the capital of Albania. "This—writes the *Daily Telegraph* (November 1st)—signifies de facto recognition of the Italian occupation of that country earlier this year." This announcement was naturally hidden in some obscure corner of the newspaper; some daily newspapers did not consider it worthy of even a line! But the moment Germany enters Poland or Czechoslovakia, or Russia enters Finland, the British Press splashes horror and indignation over seven columns! There-

(*Continued on page* 196)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1940 No. 12

CHARITY FOR ALL

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphans—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

—Abraham Lincoln

MRS. ROOSEVELT ON WAR

In our "On the Pacifist Front" column in this issue, there appears a statement by Mrs. Roosevelt of so remarkable a character that we desire to bring it very particularly to the attention of our readers. Mrs. Roosevelt conceives of a possible time when this country might have to go to war—"because of some really great issue that could not be met in any other way"—and states her conviction that at such a time we "would all have to go along." Mrs. Roosevelt, in other words, is not a pacifist. *But*—she then goes on to speak of the church in wartime, and says:

> The church would have to say it did not approve of war as a method of settling disputes, and its ministers would be bound to help, not in the war, but in the alleviation of human suffering.

Here is counsel for us ministers and all us church people. Mrs. Roosevelt, herself not a pacifist, declares that the church must of course be pacifist. Even in wartime! It apparently never enters her head that the church should approve of war—even of a war fought "because of some great issue that could not be met in any other way." As for ministers, they would be bound not to help in the war, but in ways only of mercy and healing. "Bound" by what? Why, by their ordination vows, by the religion which they preach and should practise, by the God whom they proclaim and should serve. It is evident enough that Mrs. Roosevelt is not in the Coughlin class at all. The two stand at opposite poles from one another. This suits us perfectly, for we will gladly surrender a Father Coughlin for a Mrs. Roosevelt any day. Meanwhile, we are keeping these words of the President's wife for precious use in the future. If, when, and as the United States enters into the European war, and government agents come snooping 'round our pacifist altars, and boys from our church are kidnapped and brought before conscription boards, we shall use these words as our shield and buckler. If the President's wife can take this stand, why also cannot we?

WHAT DO YOU MEAN—NEUTRAL?

We are in agreement with the seven great peace groups in this country which petitioned the President the other day in opposition to loaning money to Finland for war purposes. Like these peace groups, we favor every kind of help in the form of food, clothing, and medical supplies for civilians, but not of arms for the fighting. We believe, in the first place, that to send weapons and munitions to the Finns would be a flat violation of our neutrality law; and, secondly, that it would be one more step straight in the direction of our entering the European war ourselves. But to say this is not to say that we are content with the present situation as regards America's relation to the conflict overseas. On the contrary, we think this situation is abominable. Thus, while we are necessarily and very properly refusing to send bombing planes to the Finns, the American petroleum industry has been and is supplying unprecedented quantities of gasoline to the Russians with which to drive their planes to bomb the Finns. In the New York *Times* it was published that the Soviet imports of gasoline have been 300,000 barrels per month since October, as compared with only 48,000 barrels in September, before Russia got into war in Poland. In the same way, while giving all kinds of sympathy and some practical relief to the Chinese, we have continued steadily to supply Japan with the materials without which she could not have continued her aggressive attack upon China for a month. Since the war in China began, our exports to Japan have been more than twice the volume of what they were before the invasion of Manchuria. The principal articles on the list of exports are interesting—scrap iron, crude petroleum, refined copper, and cotton! All this, it strikes us, is pretty terrible. Such betrayal of our neutrality by the influences of trade simply makes this neutrality ridiculous, if not actually tragic. We cannot favor our plunging into the war even to the extent of arming combatants, but it is our conviction that we should find, and find quickly, the way to stop this miserable business of sending provender to those very

totalitarian states which are practising brigandage upon mankind.

ENEMIES HELPING ONE ANOTHER

It is no news that enemies in the last war—England and Germany, for example—exchanged supplies and in general helped one another through the entire period of the conflict. But *this* war, we are told is different! This is *really* a struggle to the death for democracy and civilization! Yet the belligerents are dutifully supplying each other's needs just as they did before. Thus, a Copenhagen dispatch to *Iron Age* states that the French and the Germans are trading six million tons of iron ore for four million tons of coal. This transaction, confirmed by an Associated Press dispatch from Brussels, is being made through Belgium. The *Iron Age* also announces that there is an important trade going on between Germany and France in tools and machinery, also through Belgium. A correspondent of the New York *Herald-Tribune* quotes a spokesman of the British Ministry of Economic Warfare to the effect that certain classes of manufactured articles, drugs, and surgical instruments are coming from Germany to England, of course in defiance of the British blockade on German exports. The magazine, *Uncensored,* reports that British and German banks are handling each other's commercial paper, and that Britain is shipping rubber and tin to Soviet Russia, which are undoubtedly transshipped to the Reich. It is a charming spectacle, amid all this hatred and hostility, to see the enemy governments thus consorting with one another, and exchanging much-needed help. Perhaps there is more Christianity in war than we had imagined, for this trade would surely seem to be in the spirit of the Golden Rule. But we wonder how a French poilu feels when a piece of that iron ore, sent by his country into Germany, strikes him in the groin. And what does the German soldier think about when he realizes that the Maginot Line is being heated by German coal? Business, after all, is the only true internationalism in the world. If the League of Nations had been half as successful in fostering international interests as German-French traders, we should have right now a united humanity. But as it is we have the irony of war sustained by the material assistance of the warring countries.

DEFENDING RUSSIA

We are finding it difficult to keep patience with the arguments being presented these days in defense of Russia. We hear them in forums, read them in the radical periodicals, encounter them in daily conversation. They all seem to turn on the assertion that Russia's invasion of Finland is nothing new—it is only what the other nations have been doing for generations. Why get so excited over what is going on in Finland when Britain has been doing just this same thing in India, France in Syria, Italy in Ethiopia, Germany in Czechoslovakia, and the United States, for that matter, in the Philippines? But that is just the point! Why shouldn't we get excited over Russia in Finland, when we *did* get excited, and terribly excited, over Italy in Ethiopia and Germany in Czechoslovakia, and raved over what the United States did to the Filipinos, and have for years been denouncing the British occupation of India? It seems an extraordinary thing to us that, having gotten mad over the oppression of small nationalities by great empires everywhere else in the world, we should now be suddenly told that, in the case of Russia, we must be very mild and considerate and objective. What is there in Russia's bombing of the Finns that should spare her from the same curses that fell on Italy when she bombed the Ethiopians, Germany when she bombed the Poles, Franco when he bombed the Spanish Loyalists, and Britain when she bombs the tribesmen of northwest India? We can remember a time—yes, we can!—when Russia did not ask for any special consideration. She simply did not do the things that other nations did. She had her own unique and noble standards, determined by her dedication to the interests of "the workers of the world." Soviet Russia's policy was peace, because she would no more butcher the workers of another nation—let alone a small nation—than she would butcher her own workers. Russia was in a different class from Britain, and France, and the Reich. But that was before the days of Stalin and the Nazi pact. Now, Russia is just like all the rest, and asks to be judged by no higher or better law than that of the pack.

"THE CHRISTIAN FRONT"

The arrest some weeks ago of the pitiful little group of "Christian Front" conspirators in New York has been the occasion of a vast amount of jittery comment. We are not going to add to this comment except to ponder a moment the significance of such a group taking the name of "Christian Front" to describe their movement. If this phrase were used as a disguise, it would be understandable. But there is no question that these conspirators are as sincere as they are silly—that they are such idiots as really to believe in what they were planning to do. From their own standpoint, therefore, these men actually thought that they were being good Christians in attacking Jews with unspeakable prejudice and hate, in pouring out venom upon all and sundry in disagreement with their own villainous ideas, in using force and violence to accomplish their ends, in plotting murder by wholesale in crowded centers of population. Nor are these "Christian Front" gangsters the only ones who interpret Christianity in these horrifying terms. Thus, we have in New York a crowd called the "Christian Mobilizers," who spend their time in spewing forth vile denunciations of Jews, and stirring up violence against them. The vulgarity,

obscenity, savagery of these ruffians are beyond description—yet they take the name of Christ! Of course, this is not the first, nor we fear will it be the last, time that the sacred Christian cognomen has been employed to describe the most dreadful crimes. It has been the unhappy fate of the gentle Nazarene to be used to justify every blasphemous cry and fiendish deed of which the vicious human mind can conceive. But it is nonetheless shocking to discover this spiritual perversion appearing at this late hour, and more than once under suspicion of being involved with a great church of Christendom. Alas, when will men learn that Christianity means love, pity, tenderness, brotherhood, good will, forgiveness, kindness even to enemies, compassion even upon sinners? There may be much dispute about many things in the Christian gospel, but not about these fundamental qualities of the soul that would follow in the Master's steps.

FATHER COUGHLIN AND THE "CHRISTIAN FRONT"

The connection of Father Coughlin and the "Christian Front" movement has been a matter of eager public discussion. It has been made pretty clear that the Father has approved the movement, and even endorsed one of the more conspicuous of the men under arrest in New York. In which connection, it may be fruitful to comment on Father Coughlin's interpretation of this strange thing, Christianity! His own words and methods pretty clearly indicate that he is not the gentle and forgiving type of follower commonly associated with the man of Nazareth. But his philosophy of the gospel is of chief interest—as, for example, when he says this:

> Christianity does not teach that a peaceful citizenry will surrender private properties, liberties, and national cultures to an unjust aggressor.
>
> Nevertheless, the Christian way is the peaceful way until —until—until all argument having failed, all civil authority having failed, there is left no other way but the way of defending ourselves against the invaders of our spiritual and national rights, the Franco way. And when your rights have been challenged, when all civil authority has succumbed before the invaders, then and only then may Christians meet force with force.

It is on the basis of this interpretation of Christianity that Father Coughlin justifies "Christian Front" movements and his own brutal performances on the radio. But wherein is this any different from the familiar interpretations of Christianity commonly used to justify war? Take the above statement of the Detroit priest, and word by word it follows exactly what has been, and is still being, said in the attempt to prove that the church should support war and the Christian participate in it. "The Christian way is the peaceful way until—until—until all argument having failed . . . there is left no other way but the way of defending ourselves . . . force with force." There you have it! The very argument which has justified every holy war—every war against the infidel—every war for democracy and civilization—from Caesar to Chamberlain! The pacifist can denounce Coughlin and the "Christian Front"—*he* has no use for this "until—until" argument, whether applied to the Cassidy plots in New York or to the European war yesterday or the European war today. The pacifist does not believe that Christianity can be reconciled with force under any circumstances. But the non-pacifist, who is all for going to war "all argument having failed"—why, Father Coughlin is his ally. The two talk the same language. So why all this denunciation of the priest of the Little Flower?

Jottings

Borah, the "Lion of Idaho," died several weeks ago; but still we find ourselves thinking of the "Lion of Judah," of whom it was written:

"He couched as a lion; . . . who shall rouse him up?"

Nijinski, the famous Russian dancer, went mad in 1914, and had a complete mental blackout until a few years ago. His devoted wife began the difficult task of explaining to her husband what had happened, and got as far as telling him about the Soviet regime and how it differed from the Nazis—when straightway Nijinski went mad again. Now he is recovering once more, and his wife is wondering how she can explain the Soviet-Nazi pact and Finland without fatal results.

Forty Russian prisoners in Finland, asked to name the capital of France, how much is seven times eight, what are the Scandinavian countries, what is the name of the Savior, failed to pass the test. Ah, but this is unfair! Why weren't they asked—who was Karl Marx, when was *Das Kapital* published, what is surplus value? Then they would have passed 100 per cent.

The Moscow *Pravda* charges that the Finnish soldiers, when they go into battle, are usually drunk. This irresistibly reminds us of the charge in the Civil War that General Grant was a drunkard—and Lincoln's immortal retort.

The reappointment of the Dies Committee, with promises to reform methods, etc., reminded us of the verdict of the famous jury—"Not guilty, but don't do it again!"

Automobile deaths on the highways of England have gone up 148 per cent since the war blackouts began. We cite this as one more evidence of the curious fact that it is more dangerous to be at home in this war than to be at the front.

J. H. H.

Is There Any Feasible Plan for Banishing War from the World?

Certainly! The plan adopted, tried, and at last realized by our American forefathers in what John Fiske first called "the critical period of American history" (1783-89).

That period was indeed "critical," because the thirteen colonies, after fighting successfully against Great Britain, were celebrating their victory over the common enemy by turning their hatreds and hostilities against one another. Within a few years after Yorktown, it seemed as though the new America were going to reproduce the situation of the old Europe—an anarchic assemblage of independent political states, set in economic and cultural rivalry, and plunging into war at periodic intervals. The situation in America of course was not as complex as the situation in Europe. Along the Atlantic seaboard, though there were thirteen principalities, there was a common language, a common historical tradition, and a common religion. But the civilization of Massachusetts was well-nigh as different from that of Virginia as the civilization of Germany was from that of Spain, and already in this American population of three million souls there were representatives of most of the nationalities and at least two of the races of the ancient world. The difference in any case was one of degree and not of kind, and everything pointed on this western continent to the same fate of fighting and bloodshed which had beset the old world for centuries.

Then came the miracle—for it was a miracle!—of the Federal Convention, the Constitution, and the United States of America. With the exception of the single tragic lapse over the slavery issue, war was banished from this continent, and will never return again. The American system has been tested in a hundred and fifty years of amazing history, and it has proved successful in terms of peace. A population of 130,000,000 souls, drawn from all the tribes of earth, are now living together in harmony and concord. Not only within our borders but without we have established peace, for it is inconceivable that we shall ever go to war with Canada to the north, or again with Mexico to the south. We have reached the goal, in other words, for which Europe has grasped in vain. How have we done it?

The answer to this question is to be found in a Federal Constitution, drawn up and accepted by thirteen separate states which were well-nigh as hateful and hostile to one another as the states of Europe today. Four triumphant achievements are to be noted in this Constitution of 1787:

First, the independent political sovereignty of each separate state was voluntarily surrendered into the custody of a new and collective political sovereignty known as the United States. This collective sovereignty, or unit, was to be politically supreme over all the other sovereignties in all matters affecting their relationship to one another and to the world. No single state could any longer go its own way, or settle its disputes to suit itself, or further its own interests in neglect or defiance of the interests of the other states. There must be joint action, common consent, a single government in the service of the common welfare.

Secondly, universal disarmament was accepted as a basic principle by all the states. No single state was allowed to maintain any army or navy of its own. The only army and navy should be the common army and navy. Apart from the United States, each state was to be disarmed. A militia, of course, was permitted to each state, but this was in reality a police and not a military force. The militia could not act outside the borders of its own state. New York could not invade New Jersey.

Thirdly, there was established a supreme court to settle disputes between the states. The authority of this court was absolute. A state might itself accept or reject a judgment, but this judgment became nonetheless the law of the land. This court was to have no arms to enforce its decisions. They must stand or fall on the basis of public sentiment. But, as experience has shown, law was substituted for war, and war itself thus outlawed.

Lastly, economic struggle between the states was ended by the establishment of free trade. No tariffs could be imposed by one state upon the products of another state. The routes of trade, the markets, the sources of supply were open to all. The produced wealth of the nation was a common wealth. Lumber in Maine belonged not only to Maine but to Florida. Oil in Texas was as available to New Yorkers as to Texans. Economically within America there was one life, with the interest of one the interest of all.

It was the acceptance of these principles—all to be summed up in the basic principle of voluntarily surrendered national sovereignty, federalism in place of nationalism—which established the United States of America and therewith banished war from a continental territory larger than Europe west of Russia. What we have in this republic of ours is not a national but an international (inter-state) system. It is this system which guarantees peace, and this system is founded on the Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States presents the one feasible plan for banishing war from the world. Lashed by a terrible necessity, Europe will adopt some such constitution, and thus establish a United States of Europe. Then will follow the fulfillment of Victor Hugo's dream of a United States of the World. And mankind will at last be saved!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Testimony of a Conscientious Objector

A Private Letter Now Made Public

. . . I am going to write you this letter, so as to clarify once and for all the reasons for my objections to war.

First, foremost and altogether, I would say to you, that my reasons are selfish, i.e., actuated by personal motives. There is within me a wish, a desire, a burning fire, if you will, that impels me, that leads me forever to the feet of humanity; I want, I desire, I need to seek the welfare of mankind. In satisfying that ever-burning fire I find a kind of joy that can be found in no other way. In objecting to war, I am objecting to injustice to mankind; I am seeking alone the well-being of man; I am satisfying my desire, my reasons are selfish. I am glad that they are selfish this way, for even I will not dispute them within me, and no one can doubt a selfishness. Parenthetically, I would say here that this touches on my religion. The idea of killing another human being is not abhorrent to me simply because the Ten Commandments tell me that it is so; it is not because I fear Hell or want to go to Heaven; it is abhorrent to me because my own reason and soul tell me so, and I would, I must, be "true to myself." Who can say that this is atheism, for where cometh this righteousness that lies within me?

This leads us to a question that appears absurd to us, yet for the record I will state it: how is war an injustice, how is it not for the welfare of mankind? The answer is equally hypothetically absurd: it is not for the welfare of mankind because it destroys mankind, and by hypothesis is necessarily not for its welfare. If there be those (and there are) who would argue that the destruction of mankind is for the destroyed mankind's benefit, then, of course, I am mistaken. If there be those (and there are) who would argue that the destruction of part of mankind is for the remaining mankind's welfare, then again I am mistaken. This hardly concerns me here though, for I am possessed with no such despair, no such twisted thought. Yet, it can be asked, who is the god so wise among men who would take upon himself these terrible judgments?

In the present war, the cry is heard that that part of mankind called Nazis and Communists must be destroyed, while on the other hand, those called Nazis and Communists cry out that all others must be destroyed! Thereby, one part of mankind is destroyed as well as the other! The fallacy of this monstrous error is that it is not the parts of mankind that must be destroyed, but the injustices of the either-or idea expounded. My common sense dictates that the savage ideas of Fascism, Naziism, Totalitarianism, Communism as of Russia today, or any other name one would call barbarism, should be destroyed, but I fail to see how war can do it. On the other hand, I see very clearly, as definitely demonstrated by the last war, that war aggravates and abets these barbaric ideas. Be it sufficient to say at this point, that war is not for mankind's welfare because it destroys mankind.

And how does war destroy mankind? It destroys physically: kills with steel, chokes with gas, starves with hunger, slays with disease, maims, cripples, paralyzes, blinds, deafens. It destroys mentally: it shocks until death, it unbalances until death, it inhibits until death. It destroys spiritually: it tears one's soul apart and leaves one a broken savage beast among beasts. It destroys the result of man's labor: his homes, his libraries, his hospitals, his laboratories, his factories, his machines, his buildings, his cultured, well-tilled lands, his streets, his roadways, his water pipes, his telephone wires, his electric sources, his gas sources. It destroys his justice and his culture, his liberty and freedom, his honor and his pride. And, above this, though not more nor less important, it diverts man's labor for the welfare of mankind into the destruction of mankind. Verily, war is destruction.

I object to war because it destroys, and every bit of destruction harms me. For every man, woman, and child who are slain or wounded in all the multitudinous ways, it is I who am slain or wounded in all the multitudinous ways. Every tear that is shed, every drop of blood, every cry of pain is mine. Each hungry belly, all the foul diseases, all the coldness and all the heat are part of me and mine. Yes, part of me and mine! What parent would deny that his child's pain, if such there be, is not part of his? Mankind is made up of my brothers and sisters and fathers and mothers and children; these are mine; their pain is mine. Yes, part of me and mine! This is the basis, the foundation of my objections: war destroys, hurts, and tortures my family, the family of mankind.

Let it be said here: I do not object to war because I am afraid, for I fear nothing. Even if I were afraid, that would not be the basis of my objections, for I would have the courage to face it if it followed my convictions. I doubt if nations could secure sufficient armies were men to be led by their courage, for, from what I know, there are very few men who are not afraid to die, not afraid of dying in war. Verily, were they not afraid to die, then there would be no war. Verily, were every man *willing* to die rather than participate in war, then there could be no war. In this sense, I would not participate in war, for, to me, anyone who does is a coward! As for myself, I am willing to die, to suffer the most cruel torture if need be rather than be a part of this filthy business. I am willing to die in the non-violent fight *against* war, but I would be no such coward as to be led to death like cattle *for* war! Wherefore, I am tempted to ask, cometh the folly of men who would die on a battlefield, but would not die in the attempt to eliminate battlefields forever? Wherein lies the courage in slaughtering, maiming, blinding, torturing, tearing asunder thine own brother? Wherein lies the courage in murdering thine own children?

Many times I have been taunted with an ignorant question, coming from ignorant minds: would you be a traitor to your country, would you not defend it in time of need? This *is* ignorance, for the person putting the question does not know, is not aware of the fact that "in defending his country" by means of war, he is not defending it at all! What does this word "country" mean anyway in the last analysis, if not the *people* of the land? And how is the destruction of his people for their welfare? He does not know that people cannot, if they *will* not, be conquered. Someone advised me that this was a war against God and religion, that if

Naziism and Communism were to conquer the world, her religion would be taken from her! Her religion taken from her! Foolish child, how can God be taken from you? Verily, a people cannot, if they *will* not, be conquered! Let us take here the present instances of Czechoslovakia and Poland. Czechoslovakia did not resist by war, and the people were conquered. Poland resisted by war, and the people were *slaughtered* and conquered. Of the two, Czechoslovakia fared the least ill, but why, may I ask, did not both Poland and Czechoslovakia resist through a united disobedience, through a united non-violent resistance? Foolish children, how can God be taken from you, how can you be conquered? Verily, if those peoples had been willing to die in non-violent resistance (as they were led to die in war in Poland), then I fail to see how Hitler or Stalin or anyone else could have conquered them! No, war cannot defend my country. Parenthetically, I would ask here: could Naziism or Communism as expounded by Hitler and Stalin, respectively, be enforced from *overseas* on the American people? I most certainly do not believe so! The danger is not in their guns, but in their foul ideas. These barbaric ideas will never be, can never be, brought over and enforced upon us with the weapons of war, but they most certainly can come from within our land! To fight these ideas as expounded by those who would call themselves Americans, this is the fight to fight, this is the fight to enter into and to give oneself to, if one would defend his country. Let us make this democracy a living democracy: economically, socially as well as politically, and by so doing defend our country! Verily, I would conclude this point: my country, the people of America cannot be conquered from without, but they most certainly can be conquered from within, and the means will not be, cannot be, by war.

Then there is the question of whether or not war brings some good. I am reminded here of an instance of one particular Negro who upon being called "nigger" by some ignorant soul, advanced upon him with the determination to slaughter him if need be unless he would retract the word. The white man did so, and the Negro concluded thereby that by using this means of force, or at least having the intention of using this means of force, he had completely eliminated the prejudice from this white man's mind! I know that such things as prejudice, intolerance, hatred, poverty, slavery, tyranny, and all the other evils and injustices that beset mankind can never be, as they have never been, eradicated by violent means. And war, as a means, most certainly does *not* eradicate them, and it most certainly *does* aggravate them. Who would deny that were it not for the conditions that Germany was left in as a result of the last war, Hitler and his ideas would never have existed? Verily, the devastation left in the wake of the last war was the seed that gave Naziism birth. Am I to believe that the results of this war will be any different, will leave less destruction than the last? Naziism or any other tyranny will never be, as it has never been, destroyed by war; tyranny destroys itself; the rottenness of tyranny chokes itself to death.

Thus, in summation, I would say that my reasons for objection to participation in war are inherent in the truth and justice that lie within me: war is not for the welfare of the peoples of the earth, because war, in itself, as well as in its aftermath, destroys; and because it never has, nor ever will, bring any good to this earth.

C. C.

The Dilemma of a Pacifist*

WILLIAM BOTTOMLEY

In the Melbourne *Herald*, of Saturday, March 18, 1939, an article by Professor Walter Murdoch appeared under the title: "Defense or Surrender—The Creed of a Pacifist." I have a great admiration for Professor Murdoch. He is a writer of delightful essays, "full of wise saws and modern instances," a lover of men, but aware of our weaknesses; a man of learning, yet unpretentious; a democrat and a shrewd critic, and a teacher and writer who has lifted the study of literature out of dullness into brightness. Altogether, a man of whom Australians can be proud. Would that there were more like him.

But Professor Murdoch is in a dilemma. I think his *Herald* article clearly shows that. It is the dilemma of a pacifist. He begins by saying that he is a "pacifist who believes that Australia must prepare to defend herself by force if the need should arise." As a pacifist he believes that absolute pacifism may be right, and by absolute pacifism he means the refusal under any conditions to take up arms. He says:

> It may be that war will never be abolished, but will continue and become more and more hellish, until some nation has the courage to set an example to the world by laying down its arms. It may be that the world's salvation depends on its learning the lesson of history, that violence settles nothing, and gets humanity nowhere. I see no reason to rule out the possibility that, in the long run —say, in the course of a few centuries—the absolute pacifist may turn out to have been absolutely right. But it seems to me that we have to consider the position, not as it may be a few centuries hence, but as it is here and now; we have to ask ourselves what is practicable and possible in the world today. Obviously—at least it seems to me obvious—what is not practicable is to expect any nation, as the world now is, to lay down its arms. We are all too cowardly, if you like to put it so; anyhow, we will not do it. All that the absolute pacifist can hope to do is, not to induce his nation to abjure the use of force, but to divide its ranks and weaken its efforts, and make it more likely to be defeated. Thus his influence, for what it may be worth, will help to give victory to the nation which has given its undivided allegiance to naked force, and which holds pacifism in contempt as folly and weakness. And so, if we are to call one another names, I venture to suggest that the real traitor to the cause of pacifism is the absolute pacifist; for he is doing his best—with excellent intentions—to sap the strength of nations which are the defenders of the pacific ideal against the worshippers of force.

It is only fair to Professor Murdoch to make that lengthy quotation, so as to avoid any possibility of misrepresenting him. And it is all the more important because he has set down what undoubtedly is the thought of many people who are lovers of peace, but who feel themselves driven by the logic of events to take up the attitude which he has so clearly stated. But now let us look more closely at this statement. Professor Murdoch admits that the lesson of history is "that violence settles nothing, and gets humanity no-

*This is a sermon delivered at the Unitarian Church, East Melbourne, Australia, on March 26, 1939. It has just now been published "to reach a wider public."—UNITY is glad to do its part in publishing for the reading of Americans.—*Editor.*

where." If that is so, why oppose violence with violence? And why may absolute pacifism be right a few centuries hence, but not right now? For it must be remembered that the absolute pacifist is not distinguished only by his refusal to take up arms, but by his belief that wrongs can only be righted by a positive spirit of justice and good will. Such a spirit, the pacifist believes, can only be manifested by discarding methods of force, and by proving his sincerity by standing unarmed before his adversary.

There is, however, a sting in the tail of the paragraph I have quoted which must not be allowed to pass unchallenged. It is the word "traitor." "The real traitor to the cause of pacifism" (he does not call him a traitor to his country) "is the absolute pacifist; for he is doing his best—with excellent intentions—to sap the strength of nations which are the defenders of the pacific ideal against the worshippers of force." Now is that really so? Can we make such a clear-cut division between the totalitarian countries—the dictatorship countries—and the democracies? If we could, the problem would be simplified; we should, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing which were black and which were white; which countries were evil and which were good. Is not Professor Murdoch writing as if he believed that, if war comes between the dictatorship countries and the democracies, the real issue will be between slavery on the one hand and freedom on the other? But what are the facts? The chief fact to be borne in mind in this connection is that the quarrel between, let us say, Germany, Italy and Japan, on the one hand, and Britain and France on the other, is not one of ideologies, but of rival imperialisms. I know which of the two imperialisms I prefer; naturally, I prefer British imperialism to German imperialism, but this is only the choice of two evils. The absolute pacifist cannot be an imperialist, for all imperialisms are founded and maintained by force. That is the reason why Britain consistently refused to disarm after the war; she needed her armies to keep her Empire intact. The Empire is feverishly strengthening its armaments now, not to defend the pacific ideal, but because its imperialism is threatened. Can anyone, after facing the facts, really claim that our pacific ideals were threatened? Is it not obvious that our trade monopolies, our superior economic advantages, are being threatened—what Sir John Simon and others call our "vital interests," and which British and Australian statesmen have made clear will not be sacrificed in the cause of peace?

Thus it follows that the brand of pacifist to which Professor Murdoch belongs—what he calls the "realistic pacifists"—is being enlisted in the defense, not of ideals of "humaneness, justice, and freedom," but of an imperalism existing on armed force and which, in actual practice, breeds the germs of future war. Let us get this clearly fixed in our minds: So long as Imperialism exists, just so long will the world suffer from war. In the war that is now threatened, and in all future wars between rival sovereign states, the idealism of the pacifist will be exploited and enlisted in the service of mammon, unless he makes a firm stand and refuses to be so engaged. Let me commend to you the words of George G. Armstrong, ex-President of the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches, in the *Inquirer,* of February 11, 1939:

> In increasing numbers in every country men are determined *not* to wage war. That is the streak of light dawning on the horizon. This thing has become too big, too menacing, too uncontrollable to be met and defeated by anything less than by the revolt of individual man, and in sufficient numbers to make war no longer possible. And that is coming. However it may have been in the past, the war machine is too horrible, too wicked in its effects, for *any* cause—least of all the cause of mere self-defense—to justify its use or to justify the individual in sanctioning or supporting its use. *No* consequences of the resistance to the call to arms could be more terrible than the wound which participation must inflict on an awakened conscience.

The dilemma in which Professor Murdoch must eventually find himself, as well as all those who fondly believe that it is possible for the "realistic pacifist" to engage in a war of defense, becomes apparent, when he states that "any interference with our civil liberties —any hint of what we call Fascism in government methods—will lead to disillusionment and skepticism and disunion and weakness; it will rob us of our most formidable weapon. Vigilance in defense of our civil liberties against the enemy within must be a part of any plan for the defense of Australia. It is no use asking men to fight for the preservation of freedom if at the same time you introduce into their minds a doubt whether they have any freedom to preserve."

But does Professor Murdoch seriously believe that any war can be prosecuted without interference with the civil liberties of the people? The first thing that will be demanded, and enforced, by the government, in the event of war, will be the sacrifice of freedom. The call for a united nation will demand that those who are opposed to war for conscience's sake shall be interned or imprisoned or otherwise subjected to penalties; for to leave them free would harass the government in its work and endanger the unity of the nation. Is it not obvious that no nation can wage a successful war without adopting Fascism? The moment that Australia enters into war it will, for the period of the war at least, become a totalitarian state. Liberties that have been hardly won over a long period of time vanish immediately that war is declared, and experience proves that liberties so lost are in danger of being lost, if not forever, at all events for a considerable period after the war is over. Professor Murdoch should know that the last war in which Australia was engaged (the war that was waged, so it was said, to "make the world safe for democracy"), resulted in restrictions of liberty which are still unrepealed. A reference to the political provisions of the Commonwealth Crimes Act will furnish all the proof that is needed here.

Again, the things which Professor Murdoch believes worth fighting for—what he calls the "imponderables," the "things that cannot be touched with the fingers nor seen with the eyes"—are just the things that will be lost when war comes. The ideals of justice, humaneness, and freedom, are not the ideals for which the next war will be waged. These fine phrases will be used, we know, as they have been used in the past, and thousands of men will ignorantly believe that they are fighting for these things; but in reality they will be fighting for the possession of territory, for oil and minerals, for advantages and monopolies, and to satisfy the ambitions of men associated with power politics. The spiritual values will not be fought for in this war, except by those who renounce war completely and are ready to suffer all that men may do unto them for their faith.

Now let me quote Professor Murdoch again. "What we need [he says] is not a faith in democracy, but a faith in certain ideals, certain values, a certain way of life which democracy alone can help us to achieve (for

we have by no means achieved them as yet). Those ideals—if one may try to put them into words—are humaneness, justice, and freedom. And the greatest of these is freedom; for the other ends can only be achieved by a community of free men and women."

"Now these," he says, "are the pacifist's ideals. The reason why he hates war with such deep loathing is that war spells the denial of these ideals; for humaneness it substitutes brutality, for justice it substitutes the rule of the strong, and it suppresses freedom in the name of national emergency." And Professor Murdoch is right. These things happen in war, whichever side you are on. But Professor Murdoch believes that the pacifist can go to war for the protection of the ideals which he himself has just admitted will be discarded when war comes. Surely it must be evident that you cannot retain your ideals of humaneness, justice, and freedom by a method which can only succeed by renouncing them. There is no room for such ideals in war—not even in a defensive war.

But then the question is sure to arise: Suppose we do nothing to resist, and we are overrun by a nation which has no regard at all for humaneness, justice, and freedom? Suppose we lose what little freedom we have now, with no hope of parliamentary democracy; should we not be sacrificing all hope of building a Christian civilization in the future? Is there not a moral obligation resting upon us to defend by force such "values" —such "imponderables"—as have become part of our civilization?

These are grave questions, and they demand an answer. Well, the answer is here. Spiritual values, spiritual ideals, do not exist in institutions, but in human hearts. Institutions may, and should, reflect the "values" which have become the precious possession of a people; they are the outward and visible sign of a people's culture and, whilst they are, without doubt, an aid in the fostering of that culture, they are, nevertheless, only kept alive as long as the people desire them. Thus churches, for example, are institutions which Christian people have built, and are the outward expression of a people's faith. But the faith is not in the institution, but in people's hearts. You may see the destruction of your churches, but does it follow that the faith which built them will be destroyed?

So you may see the destruction of your parliamentary system, but the faith that created it need not be destroyed. It may seem, to outward eyes, that the democratic spirit has been crushed and has disappeared in Germany, but do you really believe that the spirit of freedom has been destroyed? It certainly has not; for that is one thing that cannot be destroyed. It will rise again, because men are men, and men were made for freedom.

It seems to me that what men are really afraid of is the losing of their accustomed ways of life. Speaking generally, and allowing for the inequalities of British civilization, we have become accustomed to a safe way of life, and a certain latitude which we call freedom, and these many people are ready to defend, and use force to keep them, should the need arise. But the real and eternal values, the power of armed might can never destroy. Jesus proved that on the cross when he said: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Love, forgiveness, humaneness, no one can take away from you. No military despotism can rob you of your right to be a Christian; no power on earth can prevent you from living the Christian life, if you want to; but the power of God can enable you to live it in any circumstances; yes, and die for it, too, but not in the attempt to slaughter your enemy. For in doing that you sacrifice the very things you are supposed to be fighting for.

You know, of course, you, at any rate, who regularly attend this church, that when I use the word "Christian" I use it as denoting certain spiritual values, and not in any dogmatic sense. These "values," such as humaneness, justice, and freedom, are not, thank God, the exclusive possession of those who call themselves Christians, but they are, at least, an essential part of what we understand as Christianity. And it should be clear to us that they are not to be defended, much less preserved, by war—not even by a defensive war. They can only be made alive by those who cherish them; they can only persist by faithfulness. "Ye have heard that it was said, 'an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' but I say unto you, 'resist not him that is evil.' Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, 'thou shalt not kill,' but I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment."

And what judgment? What judgment, but the judgment of your own soul, the judgment of God, the judgment of posterity, the judgment of eternity.

And now, a final word, which should convince Professor Murdoch and all other pacifists who feel that they must go to war to defend spiritual values, that it is the safety of Australia as a sovereign power that is being thought of by the Government, not the ideals of humaneness, justice, and freedom. I quote the Melbourne *Herald* as representative of those who are clamoring for defense. Russia, as you know, has been held up to the Australian public as an example of dictatorship, of militant godlessness, of almost everything, in fact, which denies the values which Professor Murdoch is anxious to preserve. But now the situation is changed. Now the *Herald* demands that we shall call for Russia's help. The *Herald* says: "Australia looks to another Great Power to restrain Japan in the north, or at least to immobolize her forces. That role falls logically to Russia . . . Any alliance which would compel Germany to divide her forces at the beginning of a war would be advantageous to the British Empire."

Thus, the immediate and pressing thing is to save the Empire, and, particularly, Australia, and if Russia can help us to do it, let us have her help. That may seem a perfectly justifiable thing, and it is, at least, an understandable point of view; but do not let us say that it is to save spiritual values—unless you equate spiritual values with the idea of worldly imperialisms. The British Government did its best to save Russia for the landlords by sending troops to fight the men who had fought for us; but Russia took her own way and, whatever views we may have as to the rightness or wrongness of it, the people have shaped their own destiny. Now that we are in danger, we cry to them for help. Is there anything in all this that savors of ideals? Or is it not just a political move to secure ourselves against the more militant imperialism which now threatens our interests? Let us see this thing for what it is, and not deceive ourselves any longer. Are we to be dragged into another imperialistic war which will plunge the world into darkness—into moral and spiritual darkness—for generations to come? Material ruin we know there will be; the lives of millions will be sacrificed; but the worst evil will be the utter degradation of human life, in which men will sink to a level lower than the beasts. Choose, then, this day whom ye will serve. Shall it be the blessing or the curse?

The Elusive Panacea

FREDERICK SHUTTLEWORTH

Fundamentally the economic problem of today is the problem posed by the phenomena of poverty in the midst of potential plenty, and, as a concomitant of its solution, the emergence of increased individual liberty. So patent is this that even the New Deal has half-heartedly fumbled at the problem with legislative patchwork, achieving almost nothing except an added complexity which means a decrease of individual liberty. There is a pervasive idea abroad, sedulously nurtured by conservative elements and poisoning liberal thought by infiltration, to the effect that there is and can be no one answer to the economic problem; no one plan could resolve its complexities and bring order from disruption. Accordingly piecemeal projects are the fashion of the day, and if there is a discernible nexus among them, it is the unanimity of coercion offered in exchange for a very evasive prosperity.

Scanning the isms, we find that their solutions are inapplicable to this problem; their ideology is already archaic, being largely based on the assumption that the poor are poor because the rich are rich, a conception which flowered lustily in the days of John Ball and Robin Hood, but which now lingers on for lack of the right weed killer. One can find editorials in the metropolitan newspapers where the writers have discussed this fundamental economic problem more understandingly than the intelligentsia seems able or willing to do. The reason is not so mysterious—these writers are not mentally hobbled by obsolescent canons.

It is hard to escape the realization that liberal leadership has failed to justify itself both in England and America. It is not in front of events; it is actually lagging behind in economic prescience. One could name Socialist leaders, for example, in both countries, who have been preaching the same futilities for the past forty years, and whereas once they had followers by the thousands, they now count only hundreds. It is only reasonable to assume that these leaders have no message for the present generation, that they have petrified into obsolescence and fatuity.

Perhaps the greatest single deterrent to original thinking among American intellectuals has been inoculation to the Marxian dialectic, a disease now happily thinning out through the pressure of dissident events, including two world wars. Nevertheless, this of itself cannot explain the paucity of liberal leadership in America. So far as I am aware, there is only one liberal group which is sponsoring a definite economic program, and as that program is merely an extension of New Deal palliatives, the outlook is not very rosy. No group that I know of is sufficiently realistic to face the obvious truth: that abundance is possible for all, and that the imperative need is to bring this possibility into the realm of actuality.

Of course there are books, and of the making of books there is no end, as the nation's reviewers can testify. The same reviewers will agree that in most—if not all—of these books the authors failed to answer the question which they themselves propounded. In one of the latest and more important, Stuart Chase's *The New Western Front,* the writer poses the problem and then sends out an S.O.S. for the answer. He says: "The inventors must find a method which will permit Americans to buy back what they can make . . . we need an invention that will neutralize, scale down, transform the present burden, and prevent it from accumulating in the future . . . an invention that will lead steadily to a pay-as-you-go economy." What Stuart Chase and other writers in a similar dilemma are asking for is an integrating factor, a definite plan or scheme; for it is inconceivable that any series of unrelated reforms can achieve a definite, constructive end. You cannot build a cathedral by piling Pelion on Ossa.

The strange thing about all this is that the defects in the economic system noted by Stuart Chase were discovered by Major C. H. Douglas twenty years ago, and the invention he asks for, was announced. Strange because although Social Credit is widely known, in the main the intelligentsia and the liberal periodicals seem to imagine it to be an esoteric cult. One cannot but be surprised at the aloofness of intellectuals who are agreed that our present economic system cannot survive much longer, and that action to forestall world chaos is imperative. We are aware that financial organizations have taken extraordinary measures to sabotage the Social Credit movement; this is to be expected. But that intellectuals pledged to fight for the more rational society should ignore or covertly attack a plan which holds promise of doing that which they themselves are clamoring should be done, is rapidly becoming more incredible.

When Major Douglas first announced his proposals, A. R. Orage, brilliant editor of *New Age* stood alone in his support of them. No other notable intellectual in England saw their importance. Labor leaders, Fabian Socialists, and the intelligentsia en masse suffered an attack of intellectual myopia, lasting—with few exceptions—to the present time. The late Mary Austin had a name for this state, engendered by her own contacts: "intellectual goose-stepping toward the future, stepping high but standing up practically in the same place." Writing of the editors of the intellectual magazines in this country, she found them "lashed to their own publications, able to talk of what was written, of what was going on under their noses, and not able to talk of what might be going on elsewhere; not willing to accept the idea that there might be anything elsewhere going on."

I bring the name of Mary Austin into this discussion because her life and work was a sustained protest against "formal intellectuation." She says "we have only to look at the scores of philosophies and economic and political systems built up out of pure intellectuation, and now lying ruined in the dust, to realize that without some such (intuitional) native faculty, man is utterly lost in the path of his own destiny." The great truths have usually, if not always, come the intuitional way: Newton's discovery of the law of gravity; Harvey's theory of the circulation of the blood; Darwin's theory of evolution. The now famous A+B theorem of Major C. H. Douglas is of this type, no more instantly susceptible of proof than the theories mentioned; nor can it be disproved.

A few persons, including Socialists, have attacked the Douglas scheme in a superficial manner, brushing it aside pretty much as a Tennessee fundamentalist would

the higher criticism, and as affectively. This is the method of John Strachey in his book, *The Nature of the Capitalist Crisis,* in which he devotes a chapter to the process. Being acutely aware that very few of his readers are likely to have any acquaintance with the Douglas books—which is exactly his own predicament—he offers excerpts from the *Douglas Manual,* itself a series of excerpts, and manipulates them to give an illusion of familiarity with all the Douglas books. Very carefully he omits to give the author's explanations when it suits him to do so, substituting his own, which of course, leaves the reader bewildered. The chapters are written in a smugly patronizing style, the writer, for some curious reason best known to himself, treating Douglas as an amateur. This attitude makes the chapter doubly amusing, as the matter treated here is largely one of accountancy, and it happens that Douglas is a professional accountant as well as a professional engineer, whereas Strachey is merely a writer of popular books.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the answer to the economic problem (whether it be Social Credit or something else) will not emerge from or be sponsored by intellectuals long enamored of some plan, program, or pet philosophy, however remote it may be from the exigencies of the time. It is hard for a man to see above his own head, hence the confirmed radical who stays rooted in his heresies even though orthodoxy passes him by. Evidently new ideas must seed in new ground; the old is cluttered up with the debris of dead hopes.

As long as there was no clear-cut proposal before the public to end the march to economic disaster, the intellectual merry-go-round could be invested with an air of plausibility; there was some valid excuse for the flood of books, pamphlets, essays, lectures; ponderous pronouncements by ex-presidents and learned pundits on what is to be done next; legislation to raise one section of the community at the expense of the remainder, and political horseplay at everybody's expense. The time for tentative blundering has gone. Vanity must take a holiday, and intellectuals should realize that it is better to be right than original; better to play second fiddle than play out of tune.

No rule of thumb legislation is going to relieve the situation in which we find ourselves. A casting back to seek the fundamental faults appears to be our only salvation. This is what Major Douglas seems to have done, and in doing so has probably discovered the flaw in our economic system which is driving the world into chaos. No other economist claims to have done this. It is just this astonishing declaration which justifies the demand that these unorthodox ideas be fully discussed in public instead of being soft-pedaled into oblivion.

Although the Social Credit program is based on financial procedure, it has implications calculated to remodel society limitlessly. Douglas writes: "We are endeavoring to bring to birth a new civilization. We are doing something which really extends far beyond the confines of a change in the financial system. We are hoping by various means, chiefly financial, to enable the community to definitely step out of one type of civilization into another type of civilization, and the first and basic requirement of that as we see it is absolute Economic Security."

Critics of Douglas have generally confined their attention to attempts to discredit the A+B theorem, assuming that once the theorem is out of the way, Social Credit is invalidated. This assumption is perfectly true, but the theorem cannot be negated. It would be much easier to study the concrete proposals, for in them there is no obscurity, no possibility of confusion. An equation can be proved from either side, and the theorem and proposals in question form an equation. Therefore if the proposals are sound, the theorem is valid, and further discussion is merely academic. It is sufficient to know what the proposals are and act accordingly. Apparently some of the clever writers who have sweated out a chapter in a vain attempt to show that the theorem is fallacious have never thought of that.

If Social Credit is the plan the world has been looking and asking for, then the majority of our liberal and radical leaders are traveling the wrong road. It takes no prophet to predict that soon they will be leaders without a cause, then leaders without followers. Perhaps this is all to the good, for the world has hitherto had a surfeit of leaders, as the sorry plight it is in bears eloquent testimony. If Democracy is to fulfill its promise and come of age, pedestals must be dusted of their cobwebs and swept of their tinsel.

Parade

SYLVIA RANKIN

He is just another young man of the many in uniform. How well they march in perfect step to the military band. Suits alike, hats alike, shoes alike, every detail alike. My! what coördination! Just like cogs in an intricate machine—the machine the war lords operate from their safe, high thrones.

What if the machine is crushed in use and the pieces are broken and scattered! Get new parts and assemble them, life is cheap, the machine must keep on with its destructive work. An individual part cannot operate alone in this important job. No mind can think alone here.

Think alike, splendid young men, think war!

But to me, he is my hope of continuation through posterity for all time to come. He is my son, an individual with a separate loving heart and thinking mind. He is the fulfillment of my urge to motherhood. He is the agony of the pain of childbirth. He is my funny red baby and naughty little boy, the awkward adolescent whom I alone understood.

The fine young man in uniform does not look like part of a machine to me. I recognize him and pick him out from the whole battalion. A certain way of holding the square, young shoulders, a prideful lift to the head, the familiar line of the smooth chin and straight nose, the lightness of his walk. My alert eyes and heart have found him.

He is not a soldier or a piece of a machine. He is my son—and your son—and we do *not* want him to go to war.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

IX

The *Christian Evangelist,* a Disciples organ, publishes the following:

Mrs. Oden Sheets, of Kirklin, Indiana, sends us a marked copy of *The Apostolic Review* containing an article by Frederick Sommer entitled "Should Christians Go to War?" from which we cull the following extract which Mrs. Sheets has underscored:

"Yet not without blood was this religious freedom, so precious to us all, purchased for us by our fathers. And not without blood can such freedom be continued to the world; for should dictatorship win this war, the result will be a world empire in which the church and pulpit and press are subordinated wholly to interests of the State."

Mr. Sommer goes on to justify war from the New Testament text in much the same way that southern preachers in the old ante-bellum days used to prove that slavery was a Christian institution by a similar process of scriptural quotation and interpretation. We think he proves too much. The institution of war is not any more Christian than the institution of slavery, but like the latter is a gigantic evil which the progress of Christian principles must some day eliminate. *The Apostolic Review* is opposed to instrumental music in the church worship, to missionary and other societies for promoting practical Christianity, to Sunday schools, Christian Endeavor societies, women's organizations, and to Christian colleges and seminaries. It seems a little odd that it should be vigorously opposed to a literal interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount and the other passages in the New Testament which the radical pacifists quote so vehemently.

The New York *Times* carries the following special wireless dispatch from London:

The Right Reverend Ernest William Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham, wants the government to adjust the blockade to allow free imports of foods by Germany in accordance with the precept, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him."

He will offer a resolution to this effect in the upper house of the Convocation of Canterbury which meets tomorrow. A similar resolution will be offered in the lower house of the convocation, meeting at the same time.

Mrs. Roosevelt, speaking at a recent meeting of the Conference of Christians and Jews, in Washington, D. C., was reported in the New York *Herald-Tribune,* as follows:

Asked what church members do in case there were incidents like the blowing up of the battleship *Maine* and this country was again plunged into war, she answered:

"I should hope such a thing as the *Maine* would never again be a cause for war. We are calmer now and the Congress and the President less swayed by propaganda.

"But given a time when the President and the Congress should decide that this country's conscience—because of some really great issue that could not be met in any other way—demanded that we take arms, then I'd say that those of us who agreed, and we should all have to agree if the decision had been arrived at by democratic processes, would have to go along; *but the church would have to say it did not approve of war as a method of settling disputes, and its ministers would be bound to help, not in the war, but in the alleviation of human suffering.*"

The *Catholic Herald* reports the following from England:

A Catholic conscientious objector who based his case on the tests laid down by theologians from the time of St. Augustine to determine the justice or injustice of a war was granted exemption from service on condition that he does civilian work specified by the Ministry of Labor by the Manchester tribunal.

The objector, J. G. Heathcote, a student of Manchester University, told the tribunal that the Catholic Church had always insisted that certain conditions must be fulfilled before a Catholic may take up arms or support armed warfare. "These conditions," said Heathcote, "are based on reason and not on Bible texts."

He gave the conditions as follows:

1. The war must be in defense of a strict right, proportionate in importance to the means invoked.
2. All other means of settlement have been tried and have failed.
3. There must be a reasonable hope of victory for the just cause.
4. The war must be entered upon simply with the intention of righting a certain wrong.
5. The means used must be in accordance with the virtues of truth, justice and love.
6. The evils caused by war must not be greater than the evil it is sought to destroy.

The applicant said he was convinced that the nature and scale of modern warfare made it impossible for all the conditions to be satisfied. He agreed that the Catholic hierarchy in England had stated that our cause was just. He himself doubted whether it was just entirely.

Judge Burgis: "Is it only a theological objection?"—"It is a profound conviction."

The applicant said that although some people felt able to justify modern war by Catholic principles, he could not understand how they managed to do it.

Judge Burgis: "Your whole objection is because of the magnitude of modern war?"—"Not the whole. It is sinful in its methods and does more harm than it averts."

The United Press carries the following dispatch from London:

Desmond Tester, English actor who played the part of a Highland drummer boy in the motion picture "The Drum" registered today as a conscientious objector and was assigned to farm work.

"For me, killing is utterly wrong and futile, I refuse to do it," he said.

He also refused to participate in entertainments for troops or appear in a propaganda film, saying: "I consider aiding or abetting or helping the army in any way to be equally wrong."

Miss Sarah N. Cleghorn, of Manchester, Vermont, for many years a leader in the fight for peace, has suggested the following slogans for a peace campaign:

"War is the Real Enemy."
"War Makes Crime Our Duty."
"Stupidity Fights—Wisdom Understands."
"Which Does Europe Need—Bombing Planes or Peace?"
"Momentous to himself as I to me
Has each man been that ever women bore."—*Watson.*
"A life is a life to me, be it Teuton or Saxon."
—*Edith Cavell.*
"I am not on Death's Payroll!"—*Edna St. Vincent Millay.*
"Friendships, Not Battleships."—*Arthur Morgan.*

The convention of the Atlantic Conference of Evangelical Young People, meeting recently in Glendale, N. Y., voted: "In the event of the entrance of the United States into the present war, we . . . pledge that we will oppose such a declaration of war, will not allow ourselves to be committed to the war method, and state our determination to refuse to participate in any such eventuality. We will look to our church to support us in our stand."

The Independent Labor Party of Great Britain has launched a campaign for a Socialist peace that is finding increasing support in many parts of the labor move-

ment. The I. L. P. Peace Plan, as it is known, is formulated in the following resolution that is being introduced in trade unions, labor parties, and other working-class groups throughout the country:

> This meeting urges that the working-class movement should take independent action to stop the war and to secure an enduring peace by:
> 1. Demanding an immediate armistice.
> 2. Preparing Socialist peace terms including: (a) the liberation of all peoples from imperialism, whether German, British or French; (b) the recognition that national sovereignty must be subordinated to international unity; and (c) the establishment of an international economic order based on the distribution of the world's resources according to need, and the ending of poverty by production for use instead of profit.
> 3. Initiating a world-wide agitation for such a peace.
> 4. Holding an international working class conference simultaneously with any government peace conference to press for these demands.
> 5. Organizing an international agitation to end capitalism.

The November 3 issue of the *New Leader*, I. L. P. paper, carries a report of the growing peace movement under the heading, "Stop War Protests Pour In." The report follows:

> So many working-class organizations have reported resolutions denouncing the war as "imperialist" and demanding that it be stopped, that it is possible to give only a partial list. Most of the resolutions also demand an end of the political truce and a statement of Socialist peace terms.

Nearly 2,000 new members have joined the American Fellowship of Reconciliation, an organization of religious pacifists, during the last year, it was announced by the group's National Council. According to the announcement the increase is the largest in the history of the F. O. R., which claims 10,000 members.

A total of 14,483 young Britons have already registered as conscientious objectors, according to the English paper *Peace News*.

During the entire World War there was a total of only 16,000 CO's. If the present rate of registration continues, the total in this war will be 184,000—a gain of over 1000 per cent.

Of the total number of men called about 2 per cent have called themselves CO's. The figure has not varied materially on any of the registration days and the percentage of objectors to conscription has not risen since the war began.

Evanston, Illinois.—Twenty-five members of the First Methodist Church here have organized themselves into an active group of conscientious objectors under the leadership of Ernest Fremont Tittle, minister of the Church.

Peace activities of the church include a study group considering war and peace problems, a program to spread peace literature, and attempts to develop more systematic peace activity on the part of church organizations.

He Spoke of Bread

[Lines suggested by a sermon preached by the Reverend Arthur Ketcham, at Matthew's Church, Bedford Village, New York]

I

He spoke of bread. In the small, white-pewed church,
Where prayers for fifteen decades have been raised,
Decorous prayers, in seemly wise, (not touched
Too often, I would guess, by rash live coals!)
He dared to speak of bread, *"How many loaves—?"*
He said One cried, two thousand years ago
Where hungry multitudes sat waiting, tense and still.
Till re-created there, stood the shy boy,
Pushed forward by an Andrew not too sure
What those small loaves and fishes could avail
To feed that urgent, hungry multitude,
Yet swift, obedient, to dare his best
When that loved Master cried, *"How many loaves—?"*

II

How many loaves have we? That was the text
Of all he pleaded for: that we make haste
To bring these little loaves of ours to those
We so deny beside us, famished, cold,
Dying because we will not share our food,
Our holy loaves of love compassionate.

III

But I, that listened as he spoke of bread,
Thought, tragic, of a world black-girt in Arms;
Heard through the peaceful village church the tread
Of marching robots, clang of steel. Saw smoke
That turned the summer sun to poisoned dark.
While wings that birds might yearn for, raced with death,
And a new Cross leered red against the sky,
A cross of Hate—not Love—and all mankind
Nailed to that horror-cross of lustful Hate—!

IV

He spoke of bread. Oh, Christ of Galilee,
There are small loaves that some of us would share!
Small loaves of sweetest kernel, sacred wheat
Of widest brotherhood, bread of Thy World!
The which, that whoso tastes it, speaks a new tongue,
Sees a new world—(oh, surely, Christ, *Thy* world—!)
Dreams a new dream—('tis surely *Thy* dream, too!)
Clasps hands of love 'cross fire-licked barriers,
Pledging his deepest soul to a new oath
Never to fight his brother-men, but make
Beauty for ashes, gentleness for pride!
At long, long last a world of No-Frontier—!

V

He spoke of bread. On fire for Peace, I mused. . . .
Oh, bitter hunger of the hungry heart
Longing for bread, and given only stones!
But seven times more bitter for us men
Who seek to feed a world that perishes!
Who stand with bread that overflows our hands
And read a scornful wonder in the eyes
So soon to close in planned and cunning death—!

VI

Oh, make thy children know, Thou Bread of men!
Open their minds, their hearts, to our new word!
Look, Christ! Have pity on us standing there,
At all the cross-roads of the warring world,
Hungry to bring to men those sweetest loaves!

TRACY MYGATT

The Study Table

"The West"

THE CHANGING WEST. *By William Allen White. 144 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. $1.50.*

In *The Changing West* one finds the semi-philosophical, thought-provoking book to be expected from Mr. White's pen. He begins by developing a threefold thesis, not unquestionably substantiated, as he himself seems to recognize, but nevertheless a thesis which gives the author keen enjoyment to promulgate and the reader to peruse. This thesis involves the interplay of three factors: natural wealth, the democratic principle, and the so-called Christian philosophy of life.

Mr. White sees a new America evolve from the interplay of these factors—a self-generated America now named "The West." One feels that the author may have unconsciously modified his judgment to prove his thesis when he penned his skepticism concerning the strength and virility acquired by "The West" through overcoming hardships and difficulties.

Quite logically in view of this reasoning, he eliminates the Scandinavian population as a source of influence in forming the western character, and makes the little red schoolhouse and the white-steepled church bear the whole responsibility of character formation.

One cannot doubt that the transference of these two institutions from the colonial life of the Atlantic Coast perpetuated their influence, and Mr. White's ardent appreciation of this fact ought not to be deprecated nor minimized. Yet he leaves one a bit bewildered by the stress of his emphasis on these two factors.

One is inclined to look for a moment at little Iceland (scant of soil, subject to tidal wave and iceberg, invasion and volcanic eruption) and to ask where in this whole wide world the democratic principle has ever risen to a higher level. The liberty of Iceland bears little relation to a liberty founded on materiality.

The book seems to this reviewer to reveal its greatest strength in its discussion of the rural forces of the West as opposed to urban forces. Mr. White ponders with profound wisdom the relative value of these opposing forces and sets forth his conclusions with fair-minded detachment.

Every discerning reader interested in the future of America should read this analysis of American life. There are some conclusions which such a reader may well question but there is not a line he can afford to omit, nor one he would wish to omit.

FLORA WHITE

War Profits

WAR IS A RACKET. *By Smedley D. Butler, Major General U. S. Marines, Retired.* 52 *pp. New York: Round Table Press, Inc.* $1.00.

Aside from the author's inimitable style, the chief value of this little brochure, all nicely bound in red, consists in lists of the almost unlimited profits made by many firms during the war. Much of this material was unearthed by the Senate Committee Investigating the Munitions Industry, and will be known to the initiated peace worker. "At least 21,000 new millionaires and billionaires were made in the United States during the World War. That many admitted their huge blood gains in their income tax returns. How many other war millionaires falsified their income tax returns no one knows." "Yes, they are getting ready for another war. Why shouldn't they? It pays high dividends." These increases in profits, to take them somewhat at random, run 200 per cent, 950 per cent, 1100 per cent, to where "the coal companies made between 100 per cent and 7,856 per cent on their capital stock during the war"—to say nothing of the rackets in shoes, mosquito netting, etc., where private companies were paid their profits for what the nation did not need.

As one reads, one feels what a tragedy of history that a man with the mind and heart of General Butler should have given the best years of his life helping the racketeers of Wall Street with their rackets! Better to have awakened later, than not at all! Yet General Butler has only a three-point program as to "How to Smash This Racket." First, conscript Capital and Labor one month before any boy can be conscripted for the bloodletting process. Put all owners and high-powered executives to work at $30 per month, "the same wage as the lads in the trenches get." Second, take a plebiscite of only "those who would be called upon to do the fighting and the dying." Third, "make certain that our military forces are truly forces for defense only."

We admit that if these things could be done, they would be an advance. However, the good General appears not to have seen yet that Capitalism breeds war even as swamps breed mosquitoes. Maybe he would reply that we cannot get rid of Capitalism in time to prevent involvement in war any more than we can get a capitalistic nation like ours to pass his program. Our common hopes are in an aroused electorate; General Butler, God bless him, has his place in that job of arousement.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Comparative Religion

UNITY THROUGH RELIGION. *Compiled by Sakuntala Sastri.* 150 *pp. India, Calcutta: Prabasi Press.*

This is a report of the proceedings of the fourth international congress of the world fellowship of faiths held at Madras, India, in 1938. The world fellowship of faiths is a continuation of the Parliament of Religions which held its first congress of all religions at the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893. The second congress of the Parliament of Religions was held at Calcutta in 1929 and was opened by Tagore. The third Parliament of Religions was held in 1933 at Chicago. The fourth international session was held at Madras in March, 1938. This in brief is the chronology of the origin and development of the science of comparative religion. A change has come about in the last fifty years. There is less desire for unity of faith and organization and a greater desire for understanding and appreciation. Sir P. C. Ray in a penetrating foreword says: "In Europe massacres and burning at the stake were common occurrences so late as in the sixteenth century for sectarian differences. However, we are now realizing that the fundamental principles of all great religious systems are much the same and that all humanity is connected by the secret tie of a golden thread." For a study of comparative religions this book is well-nigh indispensable.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Peace Heroes

Editor of UNITY:

Some of your readers may be sympathetic to a project which consists in extending to those who have lost their lives at constructive forms of endeavor the honors ordinarily limited to heroes of the battle-field.

Since Memorial Day, 1923, public exercises of such character have been conducted annually at Cincinnati and from time to time, in numerous other localities. A feature of this observance has been the participation of at least one member of each of the three religious groups: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish; at least one member of the color races: Negro, Chinese, Japanese, or Hindu; and at least one woman.

Following the exercises, flowers are placed upon the grave of an industrial worker killed in an accident connected with his work, of a transportation worker killed in such accident, of a police officer and of a fire fighter killed in the performance of their duties, of a nurse or of a scientific worker who has succumbed to the dangers of those callings, and of a woman who died in childbirth.

The Peace Heroes Memorial Society which sponsors this movement is prepared to supply gratis a booklet describing these solemnities. Anyone interested is invited to communicate with the Peace Heroes Memorial Society, 842 Lexington Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio, and to ask for that free publication.

ABRAHAM CRONBACH,
Cincinnati, Ohio. *Secretary.*

Dual Personality

Editor of UNITY:

I was deeply touched by the comment on Heywood Broun in UNITY of January 15. I never knew Mr. Broun personally, but always felt a kinship with him, and his passing affected me as though a personal friend had gone.

How well I know what he felt! I, too, am "a dual personality . . . perpetually in a state of inner civil war. . . The two sides of [my] nature [tear] at one another. . ." I, too, have leaned toward Rome as a possible place of rest; but I know now that one must go beyond Rome, beyond any place or personality. If one cannot find the realm of peace within oneself, even death in the arms of "Rome" may not be "very kind." But if death opens the eye, throws light on the path, then perhaps our friend Heywood Broun may even now be walking with chin up, on a way satisfying to his kind soul.

New York City. L. N. S.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 182)

in lies the confusion. The Government of this country knows full well that the people, in order to fight, need some ideal which would make it seem worth while sacrificing their lives. Hitler offers the Germans "great things," Chamberlain offers us "Freedom and Justice," though aware that *we are not fighting to defend these ideals.* He knows, however, that if he told the mass of people that Britain was fighting to defend British copper mines in Rhodesia, or iron mines in India, or British tea plantations in Ceylon, they would not fight.

Now, since Russia's participation, the confusion is greater than ever. Four imperialist powers, all of whom deny any imperialist aims: Russia is protecting Russian minorities in Poland and preventing any "acts of aggression by Finland," who, according to the *Daily Worker,* is being urged forward by at least six different powers, including Italy, Germany, Britain, France, and the U. S. A. Germany is seeking recognition for her minorities and looking around for *lebensraum.* Britain and France have "no territorial aims" (there being few native peoples not under their control) and are fighting for the "future of civilization." And, incidentally, in so doing are trying to induce Italy and Spain, both of whom deny freedom to their peoples, to fight on their side!

This state of affairs will persist until the eyes of the working people are opened. Then also will they realize that they only can either continue or stop the war, for they have the means of production in their hands, and it is they who are made to fight and die in the front line. Without their consent, wars would be impossible; through their indifference wars will always exist. It is for them to decide now before more blood is shed, whether they are really fighting for "Freedom and Justice" or whether, as in 1914-1918, these noble ideals of "Freedom and Justice" were merely the tempting baits to induce them to fight for something quite different: *Imperialism and World Domination.*

Fr. Rice and Anti-Semitism

Speaking recently at St. Joseph's House of Hospitality, Pittsburgh, the Reverend Charles Owen Rice said in part:

One of the features connected with the present wave of anti-Semitism that is being stirred up is that some of the leading purveyors of anti-Semitism hotly deny that they are anti-Semites. They employ a clever sophistry in their attempts to escape the stigma. They define anti-Semitism in a certain restricted sense and then they claim that their teachings and utterances do not bring them under the term.

For instance, these enemies of the Jew will define anti-Semitism as persecution of the Jew because he is a Jew. They will hold that because, to their anti-Jewish attacks, they affix a rider saying that they exempt good Jews, they are therefore automatically absolved of anti-Semitism.

As a matter of fact the unctuous employment of the "good Jews" qualifier generally intensifies the anti-Semitism of the statements as a whole. Also we can have attacks upon Jews, as Jews, without direct statements. The brutal, crude, direct anti-Semitic utterances are far less harmful than the subtle ones.

Offhand I can give a partial list of some of the more commonly used anti-Semitic statements and inferences.

It is anti-Semitism to exaggerate the power of Jews, whether it be power in finance, industry, in newspaper publishing, in radio or anything else.

It is anti-Semitism to say or hint that there is a mysterious, central, controlling Jewish national or international leadership.

It is anti-Semitism to speak of deliberate, controlled Jewish campaigns against Christianity.

It is anti-Semitism to exaggerate Jewish participation in Communism and similar movements.

It is anti-Semitism to hint at, or charge, a tie-up between "International Jewry" and International Masonry. The very term, "International Jewry" has definite anti-Semitic implications.

You will note that these effective types of anti-Semitism consist of lies and exaggerations. Their harmfulness consists in their engendering a feeling of mixed fear and anger in the breast of non-Jews. All of them have been proved false. They are damnably un-American, un-Christian and anti-social.

The *Catholic Worker*

The Czech Ten Commandments

1. Believe in the legitimate right of 8,000,000 people 1,000 years old in the Czech nation to live a free and independent life.

2. Do not believe that we have lived 1,000 years in a German Reich, as you are now told, but know from our history that this is a lie.

3. Believe in our historic rights, which do not justify the subjection of the Czech nation.

4. Do not believe what you read in the newspapers or hear over the radio because Czech news sources are all under German control.

5. Do not believe that the Czech leaders have accepted the submission of our land to German control. They must be careful of their speech, otherwise we would have no leaders.

6. Do not believe we stand alone in the world.

7. Do not merely speak Czech—think Czech.

8. Do not participate in German celebrations. Treat the Germans in such a way that they always feel that they are foreigners, serving injustice and brutality.

9. Never forget that 40,000,000 gold crowns saved by the sweat of the Czech nation have been stolen by the German armies.

10. Remember the old Czech prayer 1,000 years old, "St. Vaclav, patron of the Czech soil, protect our nation. Let us not perish nor let perish those who come after us."

—*Zion's Herald*